



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/046,283	,	01/16/2002	Hun Gun Park	RPL-0026	2369	
34610	7590	06/04/2004		EXAMINER		
FLESHNE		, LLP	LEFLORE, LAUREL E			
P.O. BOX 221200 CHANTILLY, VA 20153				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CHANTILL	1, VA 2	:0133		2673	¥	
				DATE MAILED: 06/04/2004	, 7	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	10/046,283	PARK, HUN GUN				
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Laurel E LeFlore	2673				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
THE REPLY FILED 25 May 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	roid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment whicl (with appeal fee); or (3) a timel	ation. A proper reply to a high places the application in				
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]					
 a)	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin	g date of the final rejection.				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offictimely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply be later than three months after the mai	ount of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR	Brief must be filed within the pe R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o	eriod set forth in f the appeal.				
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:					
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ng a corresponding number of f	inally rejected claims.				
NOTE:						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed amendment				
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for application in condition for allowance because:		idered but does NOT place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered bed raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed: <u>1-9</u> .						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>10-17 and 19-20</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	/ / /				
10. Other:						
		JOSEPH MANCUSO PRIMARY EXAMINER				

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03)

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 10/046,283

Art Unit: 2673

- 1. The following is an explanation of how the amended claims would be rejected:
 - a. Claims 10, 11, 14-17 and 19 would be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagano 6,531,994 B1 in view of Ide et al. 2001/0026254 A1.
 - b. Claim 12 would be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagano 6,531,994 B1 in view of Ide et al. 2001/0026254 A1 as applied to claim 10, and further in view of the Journal of Applied Physics article, "Global breakdown in an alternating current plasma display panel" by Ikeda et al.
 - c. Claim 13 would be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagano 6,531,994 B1 in view of Ide et al. 2001/0026254 A1 as applied to claim 10, and further in view of Lim et al. 6,473,061 B1.
 - d. Claim 20 would be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nagano 6,531,994 B1 in view of Ide et al. 2001/0026254 A1 as applied to claim 10, and further in view of Alymov et al. 6,587,084 B1.
- 2. Applicant's remarks regarding the 35 USC 112, first paragraph, rejection of claims 1-20 are persuasive. The 35 USC 112, first paragraph, rejection of Paper Nos. 3 and 5 is withdrawn.
- 3. Applicant's arguments filed 25 May 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
- 4. Applicant's remarks regarding the previous rejection of claims 18 and 19 are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by

Application/Control Number: 10/046,283

Art Unit: 2673

combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, as stated on page 12 in the applicant's remarks of Paper No. 6, the examiner finds a motivation to combine the features of Nagano and Ide since both references relate to methods of driving a plasma display panel and further that both references relate to methods of driving scan electrodes 1 to N.

Further, the test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981).

5. Applicant's remarks regarding the rejection of claim 13 are not persuasive. Examiner acknowledges that the office action (Paper No. 5) relies on Lim to reject claim 13. However, the applicant must submit proof that Lim and the present application were commonly assigned at the time the invention was made in order to overcome the rejection.